

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 3, 8, 9, 11 and 12, cancels claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 and adds new claims 13 and 14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14.

The drawings stand objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 2, 3a, 3b and 4a-d should be designated by the legend "Prior Art". Filed on even date herewith are Proposed Drawing Corrections which adds the legend "Prior Art" to Figs. 2, 3a, 3b and 4a-d. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9 stand rejected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. As indicated above, claims 2 and 7 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 2 and 7 is rendered moot. Amendments were made to the remaining claims 4 and 9 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement being that the Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonable convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. Amendments were made to claims 3 and 8 so as to more clearly

describe the features of the present invention as disclosed in the specification as originally filed. Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made to the claims so that the claims more clearly recite that an average of the first and second color components is calculated and such average is used to interpolate the value of the first color component signal. These features of the present invention are illustrated, for example, in Fig. 12 and discussed on page 21, lines 2-21.

Thus, based on the above, the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 3 and 8 reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the present application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §112, first paragraph rejection of claims 3 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 17 of the Office Action that claims 4 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Amendments were made to claims 4 and 9 to place them in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 4 and 9 are allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

Applicants note that the Examiner did not reject claims 3 and 8 based on prior art. The only rejection with respect to claims 3 and 8 is the above described rejection under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. As indicated above, the 35 USC §112, first paragraph rejection has been overcome. Therefore, no other rejections

are outstanding with respect to claims 3 and 8. Accordingly, claims 3 and 8 are allowable over the prior art of record.

It should be noted that claims 11 and 12 were amended so as to include features corresponding to the features recited in claims 3 and 8. Therefore, the same reasons for the allowance of claims 3 and 8 also apply to amended claims 11 and 12. Therefore, claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the prior art of record the same as claims 3 and 8.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 5,596,367). As indicated above, claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 were canceled. Thus, this rejection with respect to claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 is rendered moot. Also, amendments were made to claims 11 and 12 to recite many of the same features recited in claims 3 and 11 which were not rejected based upon prior art. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 11 and 12 is also rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection is requested being that the claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 10 were canceled and claims 11 and 12 were amended to include allowable subject matter.

The present Amendment adds new claims 13 and 14. New claims 13 and 14 respectively depend from claims 11 and 12. Thus, new claims 13 and 14 are allowable being that they depend from allowable base claims 11 and 12.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 11-14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.39119X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600